

The Special Committee of Inquiry met on June 23rd in Acting President Colclough's office for the purpose of receiving his account of the facts in the matter of the selection of a new president against the recommendations of the Special Faculty Committee. Professors Reuben Wood, Wolfgang Kraus and J. Forrester Davison were present.

President Colclough recounted the following:

In his role and function as Acting President he met all the individuals invited to the University and spent considerable time with them both before and after they saw other people. It was the same role he had played after the retirement of President Marvin. Very often the person asked to come back to see him after they had visited with everyone else. He feels he is as conversant with the University as a whole as anybody, academically, financially, etc. One thing he did not say is that he reported to the Board of Trustees Committee through the Chairman of the Board on each person because all were not really ~~every~~ top candidates. In reporting these meetings, he did include reports from Deans. He felt this present Committee should talk with the Deans and Chairmen. He arranged in each case for the visitor to meet with the deans in a group and in each case, they submitted a report on their actions.

Q. Did the deans actually function as a group?

A. No, as individuals. I got an individual memorandum from each of them. They sent a memorandum in each case. In the case of Dr. Elliott the actual memoranda were sent to Mr. Ellison.

The only other factual thing President Colclough stated he had to report was that he found Dr. Elliott eminently qualified and so reported. He met him around the middle of May. He found him in the top group.

Q. One of the strongest suggestions we have had is that we would be obliged to get the affirmative elements in Dr. Elliott's case. As an ex officio member of the Board of Trustees, could you tell us something about Dr. Elliott?

A. President Colclough said that if it would be of any use to this Committee, he would like to mention that Mr. Berg, Public Relations Director, has a whole file on Elliott. (Among the very best of which was the news item in the Portland Times Herald)

He stated he found Dr. Elliott most impressive, based on his experience particularly at Cornell. He liked his knowledge of the challenge there appeared to be at this University as a private, non-sectarian institution in the Nation's capital, and his appreciation of this fact; his understanding of how a University President should function vis à vis the faculty, vis à vis the Board of Trustees. He said Dr. Elliott expresses himself extremely capably. He has the art of self-expression.

In this connection, how do you explain the fact that from what we can make out and have heard presented by two members of the Board over the months (including Mr. Ellison) the Board was certainly determined to seek someone for this position who would be a man of national reputation, considerable eminence, both professionally and academically. These particular criteria do not, I think, apply to Dr. Elliott?

A. He is nationally known in my book. I think he has many qualifications.

Q. One member of the Board stated that he certainly hoped the new President would be someone so widely known that normal people from Chatanooga to Portland would recognize his name. I said it did not seem that important. But why did this lose its importance to the Board?

A. President Colclough said he would not comment on this. He said it would not help the Committee in gaining any facts. He would merely say he had found Dr. Elliott eminently qualified as a University President.

Q. Have you any idea when he will be coming to the campus?

A. He will be coming in the middle of July. The President has talked with him numerous times. He will arrange a schedule for Dr. Elliott to meet representative groups of the faculty. He has made it clear that he wishes President Colclough to do so in order that his visit will be as meaningful as possible.

Q. Has President Elliott seen the copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Faculty on June 7, 1965?

A. The President has sent him all kinds of material just as they had done to President Carroll.

Q. Did President Elliott know of the recommendations of the Faculty Committee when he received the offer?

A. You will have to ask the Trustees about that.

Q. Would you see if Dr. Elliott has received the Faculty Assembly minutes?

A. I shall look into it.

Q. Has the dean's report been sent to him? (Reference is made to the report which the Committee on University Objectives is using for its own report. It is entitled "Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan")

A. No, the Committee is not finished using this report.

Q. Do you have any suggestions or proposals for improving the Board of Trustees-Faculty relationships which we feel are less than we would like to have them be?

There was some clarification of the question here but the secretary did not record it about "differences of opinion" and "lack of mutual respect"

A. This is hard to comment upon, the President said. The President referred the Committee to the statements of Mr. Morris (new Chairman of the Board of Trustees) about improving communications at the University. He stated that the particular problem in this matter under discussion was not, however, a matter of lack of communication in his opinion.

Q. Differences of opinions in so many things should be watched. The Faculty thought that the Trustees did not want someone unacceptable to them. Perhaps we pushed too hard for one candidate?

A. In this connection, the President thought it was the committee's business to find out the facts about communication with members of the faculty assembly and the Board. He said that, as the Committee of Inquiry well knew, there had been considerable communication between the Faculty Assembly (as apart from Deans and Chairmen) and the Faculty Assembly elected a Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees on the Selection of a President. Also, as this Committee well

knew, there had been considerable communication not through their own Committee. Many members of the Board of Trustees had received long distance calls from members of the Faculty directly.

The Committee also knew, President Colclough remarked, about petitions sent to the Board of Trustees in writing by people not on the Selection Committee.

Q. Why was it thought necessary, or even desirable, to make the appointment of Dr. Elliott at this time and not wait any longer?

A. The President stated that he would have to say that any member of the Board of Trustees would express this differently. His own feeling was that the Board of Trustees agreed completely with their own selection committee that they had found the man.

(There were some off-the-record remarks here)

Q. Did the Board of Trustees take the Faculty Committee seriously?

A. Many members of the Faculty were expressing opinions not through their own Committee. I never had any dealings with the Committee except with Dr. Brown personally. The Faculty Committee never consulted me at all.

Q. We would like to bring up as a fact that a number of students have come to members of the Committee and expressed their deep concern at the tone of the editorial comments in the two leading papers in this city. If it signified anything, it tended to indicate a kind of depreciation and contempt for the value of a faculty committee. This has raised many questions in view of the fact that it is well-known that members of the Board are closely related to these newspapers. Far from advancing the welfare of the University, this sort of attitude detracts from the image of the University. To what extent is there some sort of understanding of this problem among the Trustees?

A. I don't know who wrote the editorials. The head of a newspaper, however, is not held responsible for its editorials.

Q. How do you account for these editorials?

A. I can't throw any light on it. ~~They had me over a barrel.~~ I told Mr. Robinson of the New York Times that his story was factually not so.

Q. The thing that depresses us was that the editorials did not reflect what the newspaper, stories said?

A. Yes.

Q. There was a very extensive news story published in the Sunday edition of the Washington Star, but the most comprehensive story was published not in Washington but in Maine. Why was it not published in the Evening Star? (Apparently a story by Mr. John Matthews).

A. There ~~were~~ two stories published in the Star. The first one just after the Faculty Assembly meeting. This mentioned that the meeting ~~was~~ "acrimonious." I told them this was in error right after it appeared in the paper. He wanted to get it into the late edition of the Star he said. The next evening it was completely different in the Star. The best story appeared in the Portland Sunday Star on Sunday, June 13th, 1965.

Q. What can be done to make the atmosphere on the campus better when President Elliott comes down? One of the facts rated highly by accreditation groups is good relations between the faculty and the Board of Trustees. The Middle States will be coming in

the near future. (President Colclough said they would be coming in 1967). What can we do to improve faculty-trustee relationships?

A. President Colclough said he did not fully understand this question in view of the fact that there was extensive communication between the Faculty and the Trustees recently, but they reached different conclusions.

Q. The Faculty feels humiliated in these circumstances?

A. The President stated he wanted to be as helpful as he could. He had stated his own opinion of Dr. Elliott. That is the only fact he had to offer. The Resolution calls for the committee to ascertain the facts only.

Q. Communication is all very well and this Committee believes there is a fair amount of it. Most of the time there was, but it was a formalized sort. Here was the Committee of the Board and here was the Faculty Committee. Everything went to or through the Chairman of the Board (There was some statement of a different type of faculty-trustee committee working well at Haverford or Swarthmore with the two parties cooperating toward a single goal or function and contrasting this with The George Washington University faculty-trustee relations as "confrontation and exchange.")

A. The President said he could not comment on the above. It was "theorizing" He mentioned that Dr. Brown spoke highly of communication between the Committees (the Faculty Committee and the Board Committee) in one of the Interim Reports to the Faculty.

Q. Some of the members of the Faculty's elected Committee have accused some lawyers on the Board Committee in these transactions of having been "deliberately deceived" by them.

A. The President stated that Dr. Brown did not seem to feel that way. The Committee never consulted President Colclough. He never took a position. He did not say anything before the Faculty Assembly.

Q. We are distressed that we cannot have Mr. Ellison answer any questions.

A. The President agreed and stated that Mr. Ellison is out of town on an extended trip.

The President then reiterated that he wanted to continue to be as helpful as possible to the committee. He stands ready to do this because he believes it is his function to get the University in the best shape possible in the shortest possible time for Dr. Elliott's arrival.

Q. We are looking toward your judgment. How would you suggest we talk to the two members of the Board tomorrow?

A. The President would suggest that perhaps the approach they had taken this morning in getting the facts from the members of the Board would be the best and then go into the area of the important backdrops later as they had done with him. He said he had given the facts in his role as Acting President and tried to be as helpful as he could be.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

June 24, 1965

MEMORANDUM to Mrs. Brosnan:

If the document is to be entirely used within the committee solely to provide raw material for its own report, it's OK. If it were to appear as a permanent part of the record, or in any way to be used except as disposable notes, I should like to clarify a few mis-emphases and omissions and mis-attributions.

Thanks for letting me see it -- and thanks for your good work.



Calvin D. Linton

cc: Prof. Wood

P.S. I've sent the report on to Prof. Wood  
with a few verbal alterations.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

June 24, 1965

MEMORANDUM to Mrs. Brosnan:

If this document is to be entirely used within the committee solely to provide raw material for its own report, it's OK. If it were to appear as a permanent part of the record, or in any way to be used except as disposable notes, I should like to clarify a few mis-emphases and omissions and mis-attributions.

Thanks for letting me see it -- and thanks for your good work.

Calvin D. Linton

cc: Prof. Wood 

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Dear Linton

These are the notes on the Committee interview with you on 21 June. There is no real attempt to quote you. They are to be used merely as notes in formulating the final report of the Committee. If there is any misstatement or anything further you would care to add, would you call Mr. Ruben Wood, Chairman.

Thank you.

Luck Rosman  
Secretary

10

The Special Committee of Inquiry met with Dean Calvin D. Linton of Columbian College of Arts and Sciences on 21 June 1965 for the purpose of obtaining his recollections of the two memoranda which were sent by the Deans and Department Chairman with regard to the Selection of a new President for the University. Mr. Wood and Mr. Davison were present. Mr. Kraus was absent. Dean Linton recounted the following:

Q. What do you think was the motivation for calling the Deans and Chairmen together for these meetings?

A. The meetings were called at the request of two of the Chairmen and the assurance of the other Chairmen that they wanted such a meeting.

Q. Some have said that the ostensible reason for the meetings was that John A. Brown had received an offer from an outside institution which required him to say he was available by Thursday or Friday. What is your opinion of that.

A. Dean Linton said there was nothing material in such a statement. The Chairmen felt that in a matter of such academic importance, it was time to take an interest in the matter. At the meeting, very few knew of any offer which had been received by Mr. Brown. The issue was quite simple. The feeling was that the Board Committee was making no progress so they wanted to talk about it for the good of the University. There was a feeling that the University was stagnant and it was felt necessary to move ahead on some track. No mention was made of Mr. Brown in the prepared statement. Just that the University was injured by no action being taken at all. They felt that the Acting President's health was deteriorating. The primary discussion at these meetings was the need to move ahead and get responsible leadership. The first mention of Mr. Brown came from a letter which Dean Burns had.

Q. The Board of Trustees was opposed to Mr. Brown and opposed to his other position as Dean of Faculties. Did Dean Burns not realize that he was creating a boomerang?

A. Dean Linton replied that he did not think so because after all, Dean Burns was presenting the letter. (the letter was approved by all present and signed and it was agreed that a copy should be hand-carried to Mr. Ellison.)

Q. What day was the meeting with Ellison?

A. Perhaps May 11 or 12. At this meeting Mr. Ellison said Mr. Brown was a very active candidate. The hostility was very clear at the meeting but he (Mr. Brown) was an active candidate. The others were then ~~Mr.~~ <sup>Dr.</sup> Coles and Dr. Elliott.

Q. One of the things you said was that there seemed to be a time for the academic community to take an interest in the matter. You thought the Committee of Ten should act directly? Did you intend to undercut this Committee (The Special Committee to Advise and Consult etc.)?

A. It never occurred to Dean Linton that they were undercutting the Committee.

Q. Was there any talk about the resignations (This apparently referred to the three members of the Special Committee who intended to resign) If the Committee was no longer considered objective, should the Special Committee not have been dismissed before the Deans and Faculty acted?

A. No reply recorded to this question.

Q. Professor Miller said that many people were against him (the Secretary does not know whether this referred to Mr. Brown or Mr. Elliott)

A. Dean Linton said he did not know anything about it at all.



The Deans and Chairman are ambivalent - part of the Administration and part of the Faculty. They should decide the channels through which information should go to the Trustees.

Many letters were written last summer in support of Mr. Brown to members of the Trustees but none had communicated this information to each other.

Dean Linton only thought of this as a meeting to give the Committee support with the Board of Trustees and to let them know the deans and chairmen were supporting them.

Q. The second letter had more signatures. How do you account for that?

A. Deans Mason and Hamblin voted with the letter the first time but they did not sign it. When the ~~second~~ letter was written, Deans Mayo and Kramer were out of town. Dean Mayo sent a separate letter later. *Why Deans Mason & Hamblin signed the second (June 1) letter but not the first, Dean Linton did not know.*

Q. With reference to the criteria set up by the Special Committee. Were these ever contested by the Faculty?

A. No.

(There was some discussion here of Dean Linton's attendance at the Middle States Convention which was declared "off the record")

Q. Is there any chance of asking Elliott to come down?

A. ~~No reply recorded.~~ *Dean Linton said he hoped so.*

Q. Should we attempt to have Mr. Brown confirmed as Provost of the University?

A. ~~No reply recorded.~~ *Definitely yes.*

Q. If we can get a man stronger than Mr. Brown, should we try?

A. ~~No reply recorded.~~

(Dean Linton stated that he is convinced of the importance and significance of underscoring the validity of Mr. Brown's attitude toward the improvement of the University. Unless we can get the Board of Trustees to confirm our belief that Mr. John A. Brown represents a vital academic spirit for this University, we shall be in trouble. The people who resigned thought the Deans and Chairmen should instruct the Committee to support Mr. Brown. Dean Linton's own feeling is that the man should be acceptable to the Deans and Faculty whoever he might be.)

Q. Do you think that the Faculty seemed to be pushing a man down their throats just as they seemed to do to the Faculty later?

A. Dean Linton said he thought the Committee was set up to convey to the Trustees that what the Faculty wanted was the strongest President it could find. We thought that Brown was fine. If he was selected - Fine. If a better man could be found - fine. The pinpointing of Mr. Brown was due to not having another\* candidate with his qualifications at the time was what it boiled down to.

The Committee was not formed to pick a President but to represent the Faculty. This does not mean that the Committee should consult the Faculty at every stage, but it should have reflected the ideas of the Faculty.

Dean Linton thinks that if Elliott would come down and demonstrate his awareness of the real situation here, the University would be able to find some solution to its problems.

There was some discussion here of the Board of Trustees attitude toward Mr. Brown. Mr. Hughes thinks he came here with the idea of taking over the Presidency. A statement was made that when a search was made for someone to take over the Dean of Faculties position, Mr. Brown was very reluctant to take it.) Elliott

Dean Linton believes that if Dr. ~~Ellison~~ could demonstrate he can see both sides, could be seen walking about the campus with some of the new Trustees, and seem like a bridge between the Board and the Faculty we could have some constructive expectations. But if Dr. Elliott comes and stays upstairs in the Board room - - - .

(There was a statement here about Dean Hamblins having written a letter to Dr. Elliott.)

Dean Linton said he was depressed to have to drag Dr. Elliott into the problems but if Dr. Elliott could do something about our basic problem of a totally uninvolved Board and a committed Faculty, he would "go along with him." If Dr. Elliott could make some clear explicit utterances on the subject, it would also be good.

The Faculty did not lack opportunities to talk to the Board Committee, but the Board does not understand what we are trying to say. They feel the Faculty does not have any feelings in these matters. Dean Linton feels there is a glimmer of hope that with the new officers in charge of the Board, they will realize now that there is a University here. Dean Linton thinks Dr. Elliott came in at a most propitious moment if he wishes to do anything with the Board.

Q. About the letter from Ellison to the Board Committee on June 3rd (or May 20th) Do you know about that?

A. They did get such a communication, but Dean Linton does not know on what date.

In summing up the problems to be handled, the following list evolved:

- |  |   |                   |
|--|---|-------------------|
| a) Get Dr. Elliott down here.                  | ) | These may not     |
| Establish some sort of communication with him. | ) | have been Dean    |
| b) Find out about the letter.                  | ) | Linton's remarks. |
| c) Look into the T Committee idea.             | ) |                   |

Dean Linton stated that as members of the Academic Policy Committee, each dean wrote about each candidate. They were called in to interview Ransom, Perkins, Coles, etc.

Dean Linton wondered if Dr. Elliott knew he was in a position to do something with the Board that no one had been able to do for 30 years.

Dean Linton pointed out that the University's hope for excellence was impeded by

- 1) Faculty salaries
- 2) Lack of facilities
- 3) The level of admission standards
- 4) Retention of \_\_\_\_\_ (The secretary did not hear this)
- 5) Lack of good housing

He pointed out the need for Mr. Brown's type of spirit to really achieve academic excellence at the University. (Mr. Morris would like to create something along the lines of William's College) Dr. Elliott is a man for expansion rather than academic excellence.

The Dean referred to an evaluation and accreditation group who had surveyed the campus ten years ago and was due to do so again shortly only to find many of the things (such as the library) exactly as they had been 10 years ago, ~~when they were disapproved~~ *when they were criticized.*

The Dean also warned of student unrest which would probably reach a climatic stage next ~~Fall~~. *Spring*.

There was a discussion also of a possible need for a group consisting of 2 or 3 top-flight educational consultants to survey the University prior to the visit of the regular accreditation survey people ~~come~~. This would need Board approval, of course, but would not be expensive. Perhaps Dr. Elliott could make this his first order of business.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10.